REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated July 5, 2005. Claims 1, 3-5, 7-10, and 11-12, are currently pending in the application. As indicated above, Claims 3, 6, and 9 have been cancelled without prejudice. It is gratefully acknowledged that the Examiner has found allowable subject matter in Claims 2-4 and 6-8, and has found Claims 10-12 to be allowable, except for double patenting issues.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has provisionally rejected Claims 1-12 under judicially created obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over U.S. Application No. 2001/0046878, and under judicially created obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over U.S. Application No. 2002/0012326. Further, the Examiner has rejected Claims 1-12 under judicially created obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over *Chang* (U.S. 6,728,551 B1), Claims 1-12 under judicially created obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over *Lee et al.* (U.S. 6,731,948 B1), Claims 1, 5, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Admitted Prior Art (APA), and Claims 1, 5, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Chen* (U.S. 5,893,035). Additionally, the Examiner has objected to the drawings.

With regard to the objection to the drawings the Examiner asserts that FIGs. 1-8 should be labeled as Prior Art. Accordingly, replacement FIGs. 1-8 are enclosed herein, which include the legend --PRIOR ART--. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

With regard to the provisional rejections of Claims 1-12 under judicially created obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over U.S. Application No. 2001/0046878, and under judicially created obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over U.S. Application No. 2002/0012326, it is respectfully submitted that both of these provisional rejections are improper as both published applications have issued as U. S. Patents 6,901,268 and 6,728,551,

respectively. Therefore, at this time, a provisional double patenting rejection that cites these patents is improper. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the provisional rejections of Claims 1-12 be withdrawn.

With regard to the rejections of Claims 1-12 under judicially created obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over *Chang* (6,728,551 B1) and *Lee*, enclosed herein is a Terminal Disclaimer for each of the patents. Additionally, in the interest of time, also enclosed is a Terminal Disclaimer for *Chang* (6,901,268), i.e., the issued patent from U.S. Application No. 2001/0046878, such that the Examiner will not then issue a non-provisional double patenting rejection in a next Office Action.

With regard to the rejections of Claims 1, 5, and 9 as being anticipated both by APA and Chen, as shown above, Claims 1 and 5 have been amended to include any of the allowable subject matter cited by the Examiner in Claims 2 and 6, respectively, and Claim 9 has been cancelled without prejudice. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1 and 5 are in condition for allowance, and that the rejection of Claim 9 is moot. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of Claims 1, 5, and 9 be withdrawn.

In view if the above argument and amendment, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims, specifically Claims 1, 3-5, 7-8, and 10-12, are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul V. Farrell Reg. No. 33,494

Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP 333 Earle Ovington Boulevard Uniondale, New York 11553 516-228-8484

PJF/DMO/las